

supporting dependent children may flee one State for another. While the law allows for the attachment of wages, it does nothing to allow a custodial parent to place a lien on real property. Thus, a parent can avoid paying support payments simply by keeping his or her wealth tied up in real estate, fancy cars, boats, and the like.

Under current law, the only solution would be for a custodial parent to travel to the other State to place a lien. This is not a realistic solution for most custodial parents.

Imposing liens on the properties of delinquent parents can be a highly effective means of forcing payment of child support. States already allow the use of liens within their own States, but few States coordinate this process between States.

My bill would establish full faith and credit for liens imposed in other States.

For example, my home State of Massachusetts currently has this arrangement with neighboring Vermont. If a delinquent parent flees to Vermont from Massachusetts, Vermont will enforce the Massachusetts lien on real property in Vermont, without forcing the custodial parent to travel to Vermont to fight a legal fight there.

If every State had this type of agreement, delinquent parents would have no place in the United States to run.

They would be unable to hide their wealth in expensive cars, boats or real estate while neglecting their children and asking the taxpayers to pick up the support payments.

Massachusetts has been using administrative liens since 1992. Since then, 90,000 liens have been placed, with \$13 million collected in past due support.

The Massachusetts Child Support Enforcement Division estimates that about one third of delinquent parents own property eligible for a lien.

The booklet, with the 10 most wanted list of child support enforcement reforms, can serve for a model for child support enforcement efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to allow the placement of administrative liens for the enforcement of child support payments. This is only one step to increase child support payments.

Unpaid child support payments amount to \$34 billion or more. Many children denied these legally owed payments turn to the taxpayers for support. We need this type of common sense reform in overhauling our welfare system, and forcing delinquent parents to support their children.

THE "DO SOMETHING" REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States in the People's House and to have my good friend from Ohio chair and to look around and take stock, Mr. Speaker, of what has transpired in these first 50 days of the 104th Congress.

History reminds us that the last time the Republicans held the majority of the seats in this Chamber, a President of the other party, President Truman, called that Republican-controlled Congress the "Do Nothing" Congress. And yet, as we take a look today in terms of more recent history, that description defies reality with reference to the 104th Congress.

As they might say in sports parlance, look it up. We have bothered to check the numbers and it is very interesting to take a look at this new Congress, this 104th Congress, and the flurry of activity that has transpired, simply in terms of numbers. For example, Mr. Speaker, the number of hours in session, heading into day 50 of this new 104th Congress, 236 hours in session, doing the people's business in the people's House.

Now we also compiled numbers over the previous 12 years, in the 97th Congress all through the 103d Congress, to really try to assess how the guardians of the old order were involved in business as usual.

Here is what we found. The number of hours in session through the first 50 days for the previous 12 years, just a little better than 41. Compare this work of the 104th Congress. The number of votes on the House floor heading into this 50th day, in our new Congress, already 145 votes on this floor, in the People's House, about the people's business.

During the previous 12 years, the average number of votes, just a little better than 14.

The number of committee sessions in this new republican Congress, heading into this 50th day, 313. The previous average over 12 years, 121.

But more than quantity, Mr. Speaker, it is quality of work, work that is being done by this Congress, because people come into this Chamber not to score debating points, not to take a vacation at taxpayers' expense, but to be about the work of this Congress and to honor the commitment of the voters of our respective districts.

It has been chronicled before but it bears repeating because it is important to take stock of what has transpired.

transpired, a radical revolution, but it is not a radical revolution. Instead, it is a reasonable revolution. The notion that may seem radical to guardians of the old order is what is reasonably expected by the bulk of Americans, this simple notion that Congress people live under the laws that everyone else lives under. The Shays Act incorporated into our House rules in this 104th Congress, and then a notion that this legislative branch should lead by example. We have done so, cutting committee staffs by one-third, calling for an independent audit of this body to understand where the people's money has gone, to make sure that the people's money has been used for the people's business.

Working in so many ways with the adoption of new rules to really be involved in the House cleaning, to open the windows of this institution and allow for open debate and a dialog and a new partnership with the American people.

So much has transpired, from a balanced budget amendment to a line-item veto to a meaningful crime control package, to eliminate the notion of hug-a-thug, to get away from the concept that we would do things to make us feel good but really not influence what transpires in the cities and counties and towns of America, making a difference. That is what these first 50 days have been about.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. Let me tell you one of the things I have learned during my tenure in politics. I think it is important. This is not just patting each other on the back, but it is a different way of thinking, because I was in the State legislature and have lots of friends who are in elected office, and it is generally the accepted rule that you run for office, you pass out a brochure that says how tough you are going to be on crime, how strict you are going to be on welfare, how tight you are going to be about the people's money. As soon as you get elected, you put the brochure on the shelf and do not worry about it. You basically handle an agenda already in progress, many items set by special interest groups.

So I think what is so different, you were talking about the Republican Congress during Truman's days and here we have a Speaker who has an agenda that was introduced on the steps of the Capitol to the American

party, he means to stand by his promises, that is a very clear signal to the rank and file membership, completely different. I have not forgotten my brochure, the boss is the folks back home. Here is my brochure, I carry it with me. I am going to be accountable to these promises, passing or not passing them, I will be accountable, and he pulls it out on a regular basis to the American people.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Arizona. I would just like to add to the statement by the gentleman from Georgia that each time I go home to my district, and as you know, I am from the Third District of North Carolina, I spend a great deal of the time walking in the malls stopping people to say I am your Congressman, WALTER JONES, Jr. I would like to know what you think about this Congress.

□ 1920

And to add to what you have said and the gentleman from Georgia, I cannot adequately express to you the encouragement that I receive from the people as we are helping to rebuild the public's trust. The public has lost faith in the Congress, but finally, because of what has been said by you two gentlemen tonight, they are seeing that a campaign promise is being kept, and they believe that with the help of God that we will change the direction of this Nation in which the majority of people in my district at least in North Carolina think that the liberals have taken this Nation down the wrong road for too long. So it is an exciting time and a great time and a great change for America.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Following up on that, I think the gentleman's experience is indicative of what has transpired nationally, because the gentleman from North Carolina has the great name, WALTER JONES. He has worked very, very hard, and he had a gentleman precede him in this body of another persuasion and another party, and I think it is very, very interesting to see the change that has come about with our friends on the other side of the aisle with many folks joining the Republican Party, as was your personal experience. I also know the gentleman from North Carolina, you have been working very hard in terms of keeping our promises and our commitments to the men and women in uniform and certainly the Third District of North Carolina that is very important with a number of military bases.

tesy.
Mr. KINGSTON. My jogging buddy from the Northeast who has to come to Washington for warm weather these days, we will yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Whatever time you have, I would like to address some of the comments. I certainly will stick around.

Mr. JONES. Let me tackle this, because so many good things have happened with the contract. Having three military bases in my district, Cherry Point Marine Air Station, Premier Air Station from the Marine Corps, Camp Lejeune in Jacksonville, well known for the great service they have rendered to our Nation, and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. We passing the National Security Revitalization Act, what we are doing is what the military needs done is to get support from the United States Congress and this Government, and with the passage of that act, H.R. 7, what we have done, just three or four points, I want to make this quick, first, demands that U.S. troops be commanded by U.S. commanders and not placed under foreign commanders; second, reduce the cost to the United States of United Nations peacekeeping missions and demands that the United States mission to the U.N. press for reforms in the notorious U.N. management practices; tightens controls and reporting requirements for sharing of U.S. intelligence information with the United Nations; and expresses the sense of Congress that firewalls be restored between defense and discretionary domestic spending for budget years 1996, 1997, and 1998.

And very quickly, the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Georgia, let me show you, last August during the campaign, the Cherry Point pilots for about 5 weeks, the fighter pilots that are there to defend our Nation and to fight for us overseas, could not train because of the moneys that had been spent on these overseas projects by this liberal administration, in Haiti and elsewhere.

So we are trying to restore the integrity of the defense budget so that our men and women will be ready to defend this Nation.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Arizona controls the time. We do want to yield to the gentleman. We do want to make one point from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

I represent the 24th Infantry. I had the great honor of doing that. We hope

they can stay close every time they can for the United States Government. They do not want a French military commander telling them to go up and take the hill.

I do not think that is too much to ask. That is a very important point which is what we have done.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I will be happy to hear from our good friend from Wisconsin whom I have seen in the hall and I guess the gentleman from Georgia needs to jog with. My goodness, I need a chance to go out and jog with the gentleman from Wisconsin. We welcome him to the dialog.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. You are welcome to join us on our jogging. The gentleman from North Carolina, too.

I hope I am not raining on your parade. I was sitting in my office listening to your very compelling discussion of the first 50 days, and I felt compelled to come over.

Mr. HAYWORTH. We welcome you here to engage in the dialog.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. My reaction was, again, I certainly agree with your comments that this has been a very busy first 50 days. It certainly, in terms of committee meetings, in terms of votes taken, in terms of time spent on the floor, is far busier than it was 2 years ago when I was a freshman in Congress.

As I was listening to you talk, it reminded me of the three little pigs. That is no reflection on the three of you, but in particular, in all seriousness, one character in particular, I have a 2-year-old son, and so we asked him what the wolf says. The wolf says, as my 2-year-old son says, "I will huff and I will puff and I will blow your house in," which is not that dissimilar to what many of the new Members said when they were elected to Congress this fall.

But the point I want to make is even though we have been very, very busy, the first 50 days, I certainly do not mind being busy, I think what the American people want, and I think all of us would agree to this, the American people want action. They want us to complete things, and it is smart to talk about all the time we spent here.

But I think if you look at what we finally accomplished in the first 50 days, we have passed and signed into law the grand total of one bill. So I think we have to keep things in perspective.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Wisconsin, let me yield then to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to also ask if your children are familiar with the

And, you know, we are hoping, as you know, that the bipartisan spirit that passed the bill that put Congress under the same laws as the American people and that passed the balanced budget amendment and that passed the national security bill that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] talked about, and the unfunded mandates bill, we hope that that bipartisan spirit goes on in the next body, and then the President has the great unique opportunity to say, "You know, some of this I can live with." And we hope that does happen.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think it is a valid point. I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina in just a second.

But again to follow up on what our friend from across the aisle has come down to talk about tonight, in dealing with fairy tales, it is no fairy tale, as the gentleman from Georgia points out, there are different instruments of government with different jobs, and I am sure certainly not in the position of pretending to lecture the gentleman from Wisconsin, but the fact is the other body is hard at work given its special set of rules, given its special set of priorities and, of course, as the gentleman from Georgia mentions, there is another gentleman ensconced at the other end of Pennsylvania Ave., our Chief Executive, who has a chance to sing into law the different provisions, and we welcome the involvement of the other body and of the Chief Executive.

But what we have been doing is fulfilling the promises we made to the American public and working very hard to do so, and to use a line almost Shakespearean in its resonance, it certainly is not, as some might suggest, much ado about nothing. We are very hard at work.

The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. If I may very briefly and quickly thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding, I would like to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that our Contract with America came from extensive national polling of the people to find out their many concerns and to find out their 10 top concerns. And what we have done is that we cannot speak for the Senate, but we promised the American people that we would get these 10 bills to the floor for a vote, and we are accomplishing that promise to the American people. So we are keeping our promise.

We cannot promise what the Senate will do. Hopefully I believe that the Senate will follow suit on most of these bills.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further, I recog-

Paul Harvey would say, let us tell the rest of the story. I think in this case the rest of the story is we have had one bill that passed I think it is an excellent bill. I was a cosponsor for the congressional accountability bill when I was first elected to Congress 2 years ago, and I was proud to be an original cosponsor this year. It is a good bill, a bill overdue. My only concern with it, and we have talked about it before, we did not have the language in there banning the use of frequent fliers. Perhaps we will get an opportunity to deal with that issue as well.

□ 1930

But again you are having a fine discussion, and I wanted to stop by and say hello.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman.

I think the important thing is I know that you have been with us on many of these votes, and we appreciate your joining us tonight. The thing to also remember, though, the balanced budget amendment does not even have to have President Clinton's signature. He is against it, which is fortunate. But what it does need to have—I am not sure what the count is right now, I think it is two Democratic Senators who have not voted. So I hope the people from Wisconsin, Arizona, Georgia, and North Carolina and anywhere else in between who are listening tonight, will pick up their phone and call their Democratic Senators and say, "Pass that balanced budget amendment. Run your household in Washington or our country the way we have to have our households in America." I think it is a good point.

The Democratic Party in the Senate is just bogging down the balanced budget. Let us get it passed. Let us get on to other things.

Also, on things that we do not need Senate approval, for example, cutting committee staff by one-third, limiting the term of committee chairmen and eliminating some of the committees; we eliminated about 25 subcommittees. We have done that without having to have Senate approval for it. So there are many things that were in the contract that were done within our power that we could do within these walls, in this Chamber, without having the other body sign off on it and slow us down.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I think the gentleman from Georgia, having served in this Congress and the 103d Congress, as has my friend from

think looks very well for our democratic Republic and our constitutional form of government because, unlike what had transpired in previous years, we did not move to cut off our friend. We were happy to welcome him. Perhaps it is a departure from special orders in the strictest sense, but we are very happy. I think it is indicative of this new partnership and this new dialog.

Will there be points of disagreement? Certainly. But this is indicative of the change in the way we are doing business.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin see what he has done now? The gentleman from Arizona is an old sportscaster, and he is getting wound up. He knows politics is a contact sport, and that is good to have the contact, and I am glad the gentleman is here.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. I just wanted to say that what has been exciting about the first 5 weeks is that we have had on these major votes to help make this a better country, to help small business, help people as it relates to crime, we have had quite a few of the Democrats come in, percentages of up to 60 percent who have joined us in passing this legislation.

And that bipartisan effort in coming together for America is what the American people wanted. I am delighted, I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that we are working together in a bipartisan way to make this a better country.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. In closing, again I thank you for the opportunity to spend some time this evening. I felt compelled to point out that only one bill has become law, though I trust the Senate will look at some of the bills that we have passed. My hunch is that those that will pass will be those that actually passed the House in the past. The Congressional Accountability Act, which passed the House last year. And now it passed both Houses.

My only request that I have been making, in closing, is that the gentlemen also are sensitive to some of the needs that are expressed in the contract that I think are bad for America, in particular, things like the school lunch program. My wife is a school teacher. I asked her about the school lunch program. She said—she is critical of the current welfare system, that they could use some changes, but she

insinuation that by trying to offer block grants to the States, by trying to streamline and rethink delivering services, certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin is not implying those of us in the new majority who are trying to open this process up are trying to take food out of the mouths of children, because I think that is a very, very serious accusation.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Again, I am reporting to you what my wife, as a school teacher, said. She said, "Why do they want to change this program? The school lunch program is not like the welfare program, where people are abusing it. Frankly, it is not even like the food stamp program, where people can take the food stamps and maybe have a black market. But what the school lunch program is all about is apples and milk for kids who may have that as their only meal of the day."

And I think, in all candor, I think to serve the American people, which we all want to do, I think we have to be very, very sensitive that we do not inadvertently, perhaps—so I do not mean to imply to the gentleman from Arizona that I think he is doing this intentionally—but only I don't think any of us, as a result of our actions, want to make it more difficult for children. Again, I think what our goal is for all of us is that children in America learn and they certainly learn better when they have food in their stomachs.

Again, I ask the gentleman to be sensitive to that. I have to close.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the sad things about Washington is when you do not have the facts, you kind of rattle a little emotionally and say this and that. I will not accuse my friend from Wisconsin of that, but I would say there are Members in the Democrat Party who have school nutrition as their Social Security issue that, first, we scare the senior citizens, now we go after the hungry 6-year-old.

The fact is there are 16 different school nutrition programs. We talk about these school lunch programs. There are 16 of them.

What we are trying to do is eliminate them so that we can feed the children and let the bureaucrats go out and find other work, other things to do.

Eleven different bureaucracies are trying to be consolidated, as I understand it, by the Opportunity Committee, and then four by the Agriculture Committee.

All we want to do is say, "Hey, there are too many people feeding at the

teach them about math, English, prepositions, adjectives, and all that sort of stuff.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and welcome him to this dialogue during this special order. I think it speaks volumes about the fact that we have opened up the windows of this Congress and just as we engage in a dialog here in the well of the United States House of Representatives, so too do we seek that dialog, Mr. Speaker, with the American people. That is the difference.

To our friend from Wisconsin, even as he departs, and others who may be viewing these proceedings on television and at home, I think it is important as the gentleman from Georgia points out, the idea is to make services more efficient. According to some estimates, for every dollar in social spending, 80 cents of that dollar goes to the delivery of that program. In other words, the money is not a straight transfer from the pockets of the taxpayers to the kids at school. It goes through so many different middlemen, if you will, and what we are trying to do is reduce the number, reduce the amount of middlemen and make sure that in these programs that have great import to the children of this country, to the seniors of this country, to the hardworking men and women of the 6th District of Arizona and beyond, that we have a practical, efficient way to do so. That not always is it more money and more programs and more centralized bureaucracy here in the Nation's Capital.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Just very briefly, the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Georgia are absolutely on target. This is exactly why people back home understand what we are trying to do as the new majority. We are trying to streamline government. We are trying to make sure that the majority of the dollar gets to those who need the dollar and cut through these layers of bureaucracy that keep, as the gentlemen said, the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Arizona, from absorbing most of the money.

So we are on target. The people of America, the people in my district, say to us, "Keep going forward like we are doing." We are going to make government less intrusive into the lives of people, make sure those who need the help get the help, but it will be done in a very efficient way.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

just as the gentleman noted, personal support on average from our friends in the new minority who are coming with us on these programs, there are many measures that have a bipartisan nature.

I know my friend from Georgia would like to speak about the balanced budget amendment and talk about that very real accomplishment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman. Absolutely, as we speak about senior citizens programs, balanced budget, programs for the disabled, we have to keep in mind, when we are going broke it does not matter.

□ 1940

Remember when you were kids, if you found out your dad might have a charge at the local drugstore, you go down and you get you a soda pop, and you just sign his name. You did not have to pay the 35 cents for the Coca Cola, and you thought you were getting something. You were charging it to your dad.

Well, little did we know that, when we were grown-ups, we would be charging things to our children, and you would not dream of going to a drugstore and charging a sandwich to your 8-year-old, but that is what we are doing. We are doing it in Congress, and, if we are going to be worrying about kids' nutrition programs, and senior citizens, and so forth, we are talking about compassion. We better talk about paying down this debt that we have, this \$4.5 trillion debt that we have.

That balanced budget amendment, it is critical because, if there is anything that our history has proven since 1969, Congress cannot say, "No." We have got to have the constraint, the discipline, that a balanced budget amendment forces on us.

I wish everyone would call their Senator tonight and say, "Where are you standing, and why aren't you for it?"

As my colleagues know, a friend of mine, John Carswell, a farmer, told me something interesting last week, and he said a guy went down to farm and wanted to borrow another farmer's ax. He said, "I'm not going to lend you your ax—my ax. You can't use my ax."

And he said, "Why not?"

He said, "Because I'm making soup tonight."

He said, "Soup? What does that have to do with me borrowing your ax?"

He said, "Nothing, but, if you don't want to do something, any excuse is a good one."

That is what the U.S. Senate is doing to the balanced budget amendment.

folks in the other body would also be interested in hearing from the people as the other body approaches this very real vote on a balanced budget amendment. It is important for the people of this country, Mr. Speaker, to be heard. They were heard November 8, but what I think we are trying to say tonight is:

Just as this continues through the Contract with America over the next 50 days, it is an ongoing process, and certainly the American people should not think it is a *fait accompli*, that we have already done it. It is continually evolving. The other body has a major role to play, and just as we welcome calls, I am sure the Members of the other body welcome them, too.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely, and on top of the balanced budget amendment we have that very important line item veto which we, the majority party in the House, are willing to give to a Democrat President. We might be the ones who—that might be just like a boomerang to us. It is going to come back and cut projects in our own districts, but it is more important than any single congressional district. It will help attack that deficit, and I know that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] has worked hard on the balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Arizona. I will always remember during this campaign for Congress information I received from the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], during the campaign that said, "As you're talking about line item veto, and you're talking about balanced budget, that in America today the average working family will spend more on paying taxes than the average working family will spend on clothing, housing or food when half of what they are making is going to paying taxes. How can they realize the American dream? When you have a government that is bloated and taking more and more out of the paycheck, that's what all this is all about. That's why we are the majority party."

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] makes a very important point that can be restated in the following way:

Certainly the gentleman from Georgia has also seen the figures, and according to some estimates, if we fail to rein in this runaway government spending, if we fail with a balanced budget amendment or some other mechanism to restore fiscal sanity at the Federal level, or children unfortu-

Federal levels now outstrips manufacturing as the Nation's No. 1 employer by 600,000 jobs.

It is a fair question to ask, "Does the Federal Government need to operate in such a pervasive fashion?" I believe not, and I believe that is why we are taking the important steps.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think also, if you look and consider that the third largest spending item in our entire budget is the interest on the debt, which is about \$20 billion each month, it is money we do not ever get back. We talk about investing in education. We talk about investing in our Nation's economically disadvantaged so they can join the mainstream. We cannot do that when we are spending \$20 billion a month, and I can promise you that this year you will have requests from your congressional district, folks back home, worthy projects perhaps in Arizona, North Carolina. They will not come to \$20 billion, and yet that is what is spent each month just on the interest, and that money is gone. We have got to do this.

Now, one of the things we are trying to do in the contract is the welfare reform so that people who are able to work will be required to work. We are going to try to make it so dads do not have this alley cat mentality that they can go off and just get a woman, or a girl in many cases, pregnant and not have any more responsibility than an alley cat. We are trying to say, "Look, you're on the hook, you have got to raise that child," because those children now are becoming welfare recipients themselves, in many cases drug addicts, in many cases high school dropouts and so forth, but they need to have dads back home, and our welfare reform plan works on restoring the family, and that is something so very important.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think it is very important. The gentleman from Georgia makes an extremely valid point, and so there is no mistake, Mr. Speaker, let us try to explain we are not here to demonize, or castigate, or point fingers at anyone in our society. But instead we are taking a look at the simple facts.

Indeed, from the time 30 years ago, when President Johnson stood at the podium behind me here and declared war on poverty, by some estimates we have spent in excess of \$5 trillion on social spending programs. Let me repeat, \$5 trillion, government at all levels involved in social engineering, and, when you consider our national debt and the problem we have there, by recent estimates being \$4.8 trillion, our spending

welfare reform we have to look at this very simple concept. Some of my friends from the other side talk about budget formulations, and they talk about the dollars that will be lost, the Federal dollars that may be lost in their congressional district, and to me it fails to take into account this very valid and irrefutable fact, the money is not the Federal Government's money to begin with. It is wealth created by hard work in the business community, by people earning their paychecks and then paying their taxes. That is the part of this process that we cannot forget about, and, even as we talk about runaway spending, we must also talk about this excessive burden of taxation and why it is so important to make sure that parents have money to spend on their children.

The Family Restoration Act makes sure that parents have additional monies, a \$500 tax break or an increase on deductions per dependent to make sure that families can spend money on members of that family. That is what is so important.

Mr. KINGSTON. And if the gentleman would yield, I think we have proven under Ronald Reagan and John F. Kennedy, who frankly did not have many successes while he was President, but one of the things that he did was he gave a tax cut in the early 1960's. Reagan did one in the early 1980's. In both cases it brought about economic growth and economic prosperity because the American people know how to spend their money better than the United States Congress: more clothes, more hamburgers, more records, more cars, more houses are bought by them which creates jobs, and that has a multiplier effect for more revenues.

□ 1750

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think we learn from the example of the late President Kennedy, and indeed the example of President Reagan, that a tax cut really does reinvigorate the economy. That is what we seek to do. Certainly the gentleman from North Carolina has lived this, being part of a family that has made the transition. I know certainly he champions the actions of President Kennedy and certainly looks back to those actions as a vibrant, market-oriented, new frontier Democrat looked at it 30-some years ago, and we share in that tragedy and our sorrow for the Kennedy family and for this Nation. But certainly you have seen the change and I know that you join us in this idea of tax breaks.

Mr. JONES. I could not agree more with what the gentlemen have said. I

place for 30 years perpetuated itself to help keep people down in back. What we want to do, we want to see welfare become a trampoline, not be a hammock. We want to see people have an opportunity to join the productive work force of America. That is what the Republican party stands for and that is what our welfare legislation would be about, helping people get off welfare.

Mr. KINGSTON. Part of this getting folks to work, we have got to make sure that the jobs are out there. I think by giving middle class families this \$500 per child tax break will help empower consumers and stimulate the economy through more consumer spending and create jobs. I think the other part of it is to get the Government off of the backs of business. Requirement of risk assessments: When EPA and OSHA and all the other thousands and thousands of government agencies and bureaucracies come and harass mom and pop businesses on Main Street, Arizona, North Carolina, Georgia, all over the country, let them make it harder to pass regulations on businesses, because if businesses do not have to pay so much time, effort and energy and money to Uncle Sam, they can expand. They can take that little lawn mower store and build a branch on the south side of town and create jobs that way. Remember, 70 percent of America is still working for small businesses.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think the gentleman from Georgia again is right on the money when he talks about these issues of money and taxation, and I think it is very, very interesting to see how the debate has transpired in the wake of the mandate of November 8th. The liberal media talks about anger and hostility and as if there is some sort of latent hostility about the Federal Government. I will let folks in on a little secret. It is not that much of a secret. It is not a visceral dislike for any segment of our society. No, it is simply this notion: Why should people who work hard and play by the rules and try to create jobs be subjected to unreasonable, excessive, overregulation. Certainly we would all agree that there is a valid place for a modicum of regulation within the workplace, a modicum of regulation even in our free market economy, but not to the point where it retards the growth of business, where it holds back our economy. What we need to do is unshackle the chains and let this market move forward with a dynamic, free enterprise system. That is what is so vitally important.

cies Act because the bureaucrats, if you will, have taken these regulations and these acts and have extended it to interpret it as they see fit.

What we need to do, as you and the gentleman from Georgia are saying, we have to bring a balance between business and the environmentalists. We have to bring a balance, because obviously the regulations have gone too far, created too many problems for business owners, property owners and business itself. So again, this is part of the Republican majority. We are going to make the changes that can bring the balance that I think would be great for this Nation.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think it is very, very important to take a look beyond the contract, and we will continue to do so, not only on the Resources Committee, but in so many other avenues. Because this does not stop at day 100. Yes, we are stopping here at day 50 to take stock of what has been accomplished, and we will do so during the continuation of this special order. But it is an ongoing process and a national dialog and a new partnership with the people of America, Mr. Speaker, that we hope to foster.

Certainly we encourage their input, especially as tomorrow we move to this whole concept of overregulation and we move to a concept of a moratorium on regulations, to stop that and take stock of what has transpired thus far.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it is important also for us to keep in mind that we do not want to lose species when we talk about the Endangered Species Act. We do not want to lose wetlands when we talk about wetlands. What we do want to do is bring some sanity in.

For example, I had a gentleman, a businessman in my district, send me a stack of papers about a half an inch thick. He said "I have got to do this to get a permit to dig a hole because there is questions about the wetlands." The hole was 3 feet deep. He has to fill out what I can only say would be about a half an inch of paperwork, and it would probably take a half a day to do it, to dig a 3 foot hole. Not three foot long or wide, just 3 foot normal size hole.

Cases like that we hear right and left. There is a road contractor in Georgia, and I know you know what a silt fence is, when you are building a new road that now they build these fences to help stop erosion, and that is the kind of wavy fence that you see on sticks. I have never seen one, frankly, do much good.

But I asked the contractor, how much did that silt fence cost you on widening this road project? The total

everything is had, generally you do not need a silt fence. If you need one, you do not need one the entire length ever the road. In north Georgia where it is hilly, you need it, and in south Georgia where it is hilly you need it.

But he can't have that flexibility to decide. What he says is let me decide when to use a silt fence or not, and, if I am wrong, fine me. Eat up all my profit on the job. Take away my tractor. I promise you I am not going to let any dirt move from the site.

What we are talking about is let's do not micromanage everything out of Washington. Let the Georgia DOT or the county commissions make these decisions along with the road contractor. You might not need it on every single project.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The point of the gentleman from Georgia is well taken again, and indeed the experience of his constituent serves as a metaphor. One thing we understand certainly is that in a nation this vast, in a nation that differs from region to region, while we may speak with a united voice within terms of political philosophy, why do not we try to reach consensus with our friends across the Hill? In this Chamber the biggest misguided notion is this concept that one size fits all. Washington can decree what works in Philadelphia will work in Phoenix. What is good until Athens, GA, is also good in Athens, OH.

What we find is it is better and truly a form of federalism to let cities, towns, counties, and States deal with problems where they are on the front lines everyday as opposed to a bureaucracy in Washington dictating to those groups what should transpire.

We see it very clearly in what we were able to do in terms of putting some meaningful legislation together on the problem of crime, the notion of block granting and giving those items back to the States and those people on the front lines fighting crime, so vital to our situation.

Mr. JONES. Just to add to your comments, because today at the news conference celebrating the end of the first 50 days, I do not think I have ever heard a more meaningful talk than the lady who had been raped from Ohio and how much she supported and felt that the legislation that we passed with this tough crime bill, how much it would help other people throughout America. And I thought that what she shared with us and the press being there today made us all realize the importance of what we had done to help protect America. I just thought that was a very special event this morning.

in a direction where hardened criminals could use technicalities, could try and trample upon the Constitution, and, in my humble opinion, to try and take away the legitimate rights of victims of crime.

□ 2000

So this Congress, again, is not radical, it is reasonable, recognizing that the pendulum needs to be dead center; that we have to respect individual rights and the rights of the accused, but just as the lady from Ohio told us, we can never have those rights come at the sacrifice of the law-abiding and those who are victimized by crime in our society.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, he is right. We have protected the rights of the individual, which is extremely important, if not sacred, but at the same time, we cannot compromise the safety of the society.

Yet, we have done that. Criminals on an average serve 35 percent of their time, which means our streets are full of people who have been arrested not once or twice but 7, 8, 9, 10 different times. The block grant concept says to States that "If you have truth-in-sentencing, meaning if you sentence somebody for 10 years, he or she serves 10 years, we will give you block grants for new prison construction."

We hear so often about overcrowding in prisons, and what this will do is make our streets safe by taking that element off the street, which is what the victim who was raped needs, what people in Arizona need, what people all over the country need.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think, again, the lady from Ohio, as the gentleman from Georgia made a very vital point and very meaningful point today about the whole notion of crime and punishment, because her attacker, her assailant, was able to take advantage of prison programs to get an education, and no one would deny that benefit, but also taking advantage of free weights and building his body so he could go back out and commit other crimes.

We are not saying that those who meaningfully choose a route of rehabilitation should be stifled, but those who look at their time incarcerated as free time at a health club or self-improvement to go out and perpetrate criminal acts, clearly that must stop.

What this Congress is trying to do, by engaging in debate with our friends from the other side of the aisle, by hammering out these programs, by engaging in a new dialog with the American public, is to deal directly with those problems, because we believe

newcomer. Mr. BENTSEN. As to yourself, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will only take a minute of the gentleman's time. I am actually waiting here for another special order.

The gentleman talked about the block grants, and I would like to ask the other gentleman as well, there are a couple of things that I have concerns about the block grants that affect my State of Texas.

My State has been on a prison building program for quite some time, and yet, according to the Justice Department, while we have reformed our penal code, we are building more prisons at an extremely fast pace, we are selling bonds and raising millions of dollars in capital in order to do this, we still will not qualify to meet that 85 percent in sentencing the way that it is calculated under the bill.

The problem that I see is that we are sort of caught between a rock and a hard place, because as we try and build our way out of it into the capacity that we can raise capital, and then we look to the Federal Government for some of the tax dollars that we send up, and we send a lot of tax dollars to Washington from Texas, the Congress is saying in this legislation "We are sorry because you are not quite there yet," and try as we might, we may not be there. I have a problem with that.

That is one. The other question I would ask relates to the other block grant, which is a concern that I have. Isn't it true under the law enforcement block grant program that replaced the 100,000 police, isn't it true that if a State or a city wanted to, that they in fact could spend all that money on midnight basketball or some other program that some of us might feel is not proper?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman a question, first. Although I was born in Texas, I do not claim to know all the politics there for 1995. I would say to the gentleman, with the majority leader, DICK ARMEY, with the majority whip, TOM DELAY, and I understand there is a gentleman named PHIL GRAMM who may be the next President, I do not think we would pass a bill that is punitive to the State of Texas prison program.

The Department of Justice, as you know, was against this crime bill. Janet Reno fought it every inch of the way. I suspect that information is not 100 percent accurate. I will follow up

later. The 10,000 police officers were not there.

I trust my city police in the First District of Georgia, all over the State of Georgia, as I know you do in Texas, to make the right decisions. I'm not afraid of them taking that money and building midnight basketball domes. I just do not believe they will do it.

They may say "We do not need police officers, but we need a police car, we need some radio and we need some other drug interdiction equipment," but I think they are going to be able to make that decision better than Congressmen and women from New York City and from California and elsewhere.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I have a couple of questions for my good friend, the gentleman from Texas. I appreciate the gentleman being here, but I think the point is very valid that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] makes.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] outlined what I believe to be in one sense the worst case scenario, and yet even with that type of construct that he offers us, should it not really be left up to local governments in that regard if law enforcement officials who ultimately are accountable, I would imagine, to the voters, or to the city councils and city managers of respective localities in Texas? If they were to spend that money in an ill-advised way, from my point of view, I believe they would be directly accountable to the people of those areas. I do not believe it should really be under my purview to make that change.

With reference to the prison system in Texas, and I will defer to my friend's knowledge of Texas politics, and what transpires at the State capitol in Austin, but let me ask this simple question: is there a truth-in-sentencing provision under Texas State law?

Mr. BENTSEN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, in Texas, and I will take the opportunity, in fact, to ask my good friend, the State Senator, John Whitmire, who led the effort to reform the penal code in Texas, to come up here and talk to Members of the House about what we have done in Texas to ensure that in Texas, if you do the crime, you serve the time. I will bring him up, so we are trying to make this.

Mr. HAYWORTH. You have passed the truth-in-sentencing provision out of both houses?

Mr. BENTSEN. We have passed our version of it, yes, which I think is a very tough bill, and I will be glad to get the gentleman the information on it.

"However, let me say, my point really comes down to where people have argued, and I was not here, like the gentleman, I was not here last year, I was in the private sector.

Mr. HAYWORTH. You were in the real world?

Mr. BENTSEN. As opposed to the unreal world, yes, whatever we determine that is. But I was watching what was going on up here. Last year we were saying that we didn't want block grants. Last year we were saying we didn't want midnight basketball.

Now we turn around and we do this. Mr. Speaker, I have a disagreement with that structure of the block grants. I have people who come back, some people from your party, who come around and say "Well, Mr. BENTSEN supports midnight basketball." That is not exactly accurate, because the bill as it is drafted would allow it.

I disagreed with that, so I bring that up as a matter of debate, that some of us do believe if we are going to fund things for police and that is what we want to do, that is an issue of debate, but I would say some in your party, political operatives, et cetera, would come back and accuse people such as myself, to say that I am for something when in fact I am making the point that I'm not.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas and his point of view, and in fact welcome him to this special order, as we did the gentleman from Wisconsin preceding him.

If the intent is to decry the theatrics and the hyperbole of politics, let me assure the gentleman from Texas that certainly those of us involved in the campaign in 1994 were subjected to the same unfair scare tactics, and I guess it is a simple situation that what is good for the goose is good for the gander, but I think it is only a small part of the larger questions that delivered the mandate on November 8. I welcome the gentleman from Texas, who was elected November 8 as well.

But what we see nationwide is a concept of accountability and responsibility, while at the same time we move to ensure constitutional rights and establish this new dialog with the American public.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it is important to remember that this bill takes the power away from Washington bureaucrats, and it puts it back in the hands of the Houston police department and the folks in Atlanta and Savannah and Brunswick and Statesboro and Waycross that I represent, where I

were committed, or people in the sheltered Washington, DC world.

I know the gentleman will agree with us, that the decisions are better made locally.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think we are all in agreement that it is marvelous to have this time together, even under the guise of a special order, to actually engage in this meaningful, I believe, debate, because I believe this Nation is better for it.

To be certain, we may be of two minds, we may be of 435 minds in this august Chamber, as to how to redress the problems of our society, but it is helpful to have a chance to represent our districts.

□ 2010

Mr. KINGSTON. There is another important subject that is in the contract, and that is term limits. I know the State of Texas, the legislature only meets every other year, and that generally you are in the real world as a result of that. In the State of Georgia, we meet 40 days a year, but the representatives on the State level and the county commission and so forth are generally not full-time. They are involved in making an honest living in the real world, and one of the things that we need in Congress is more people like you who have been in the real world, more people who have a frame of reference of business, of education, of being a police officer, and so forth. We need to have that element to get away from the professional politicians.

One of the things the Contract With America calls for is an involvement on term limits.

Mr. BENTSEN. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I will be happy to yield. I know our time is almost up. I know you are here to be part of a special order, in keeping with the spirit of this open time, if you just have a question.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his courtesy.

One quick question: Does the contract, or would you support retroactive term limits? Because as newer Members, I think that without retroactivity, and the city of Houston has retroactive term limits, by the way, because the voters passed that, without that that puts the newer Members at an uneven keel compared to the Members who have been here for a while.

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is a very interesting question. During the course of this debate as we continue along, certainly that amendment may come

and I made the same mistake at that time, he said, "Son, I didn't do a very good job of raising you." Of course, he had been here again for 26 years, but I am a strong proponent of term limits, and I hope that both sides, as you feel strongly about term limits apparently, that we will gather the 290 votes that we need to pass this part of the Contract With America, because the American people throughout every poll that I have seen for the last year and a half, and I used to be in the North Carolina General Assembly; I served for 10 years; the people of America want the right to see term limits come to the Congress of the United States.

I hope that both sides in a bipartisan way will come together and work together to get the 290 votes, because we apparently right now, the gentleman from Arizona, it is my understanding we are anywhere from 30 to 40 short.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for giving us this opportunity to speak this evening. I would like to thank my colleagues who are here for taking time in their busy schedule to join us, join us in this special order.

First of all, let me acknowledge the true sponsor of the special orders during Black History Month, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], from Cleveland. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for a number of years has taken time out in special orders, and although he is currently in committee where he is conducting some very important business, he will be here at the first opportunity that he gets.

As you know, the Stokes family really rewrote history in the middle 1960's when Carl Stokes became the first African-American to become elected to a major city, and it sort of set the trend and the tone through the 1960's, and up to the current time where we have close to 9,000 African-American elected officials. But it was Carl Stokes, led by LOUIS STOKES, who was able to finally break through and to be a real hero. He is currently serving as United States Ambassador, and we are very pleased at his great achievement, a judge recently also.